

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/689,656	10/22/2003	Mikhail Kejzelman	003301-054	6495	
	7590 03/15/200 INGERSOLL & ROO	EXAMINER			
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404	KESSLER, CHRISTOPHER S			
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			. 1742		
	•				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/15/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/689,656	KEJZELMAN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Christopher Kessler	1742		

•	Christopher Kessler	1742	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 20 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mu	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date.	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Office	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	is of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1. 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>20-30, 34-40, 48, 51</u> .		•	
Claim(s) rejected: 20-30, 34-40, 48, 57. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 		condition for allowan	ice because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is valid. The scope of claim 20 is not met in the specification, or in original claims 7-9. The disclosure of using an internal lubricant does not disclose a specific exclusion of the use of external lubrication, as one of ordinary skill in the art would understand. Applicant has sought to use this feature of "without external lubrication" to distinguish the invention over the prior art, but such feature is not taught by the instant specification.

The rejection of claim 20 under 35 U. S. C. 103 is valid. Although the use of external lubricant at pressures of over 800 MPa is not explicitly disclosed in Ozaki, such a process is within the overall scope of the disclosure of Ozaki. The Examiner further points out that rationale to modify a reference need not be cited in the art, but may be reasoned from common knowledge in the art (see MPEP §2144). Further, Ozaki does not teach away from Applicant's invention, as Ozaki teaches that the use of external lubrication and pressures of 1177 MPa for a similar powder yields better density results than those claimed by Applicant (see Table 1 or Table 7). Thus, Applicant's claimed process would yield no unexpected results.

In the Remarks of 20 February 2007, Applicant states that claims 1-30, 34-40, 48 and 51 are pending in the application. This is incorrect. The Examiner notes that claims 1-19 have been cancelled, as marked on the claims submitted 20 February 2007, for example.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher Kessler whose telephone number is (571) 272-6510. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ROY KING

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECH ROOM SETED 1700